

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office action dated January 9, 2007, the Examiner requested correction of the priority information in the specification to reference the U.S. Patent Number of the priority document. Applicant has amended the specification accordingly.

The Examiner also rejected claims 13-16, 19-22 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly anticipated by Stewart, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0111618). However, Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 13, 22 and 25 to recite that the generally straight distal region extends beyond the generally circular curve and substantially tangentially to the generally circular curve. Stewart fails to teach or suggest such a feature. In asserting that Stewart discloses a generally straight distal end extending substantially tangentially from the generally circular curve, the Examiner points to Figures 13a, 16b, 17b, 17c, 19, 20b, 22 and 25. However, none of these drawings illustrate a generally straight distal region extending beyond the generally circular curve, as recited in amended independent claims 1, 13, 22 and 25. In fact, Stewarts discloses only that the distal portion of the catheter body defines an ablation section which forms a loop revolving around a central loop axis that is transverse to the longitudinal axis of the intermediate portion. See paragraph 140. As Stewart fails to disclose that the generally straight distal region extends beyond the generally circular curve, as recited in amended independent claims 1, 13, 22 and 25, these claims, and all claims dependent therefrom, including claims 14-16 and 19-21, are allowable over Stewart.


In addition, the Examiner rejected claims 1-12, 17-20, 26 and 27 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over Stewart in view of Bowe, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,771,996). However, Bowe fails to remedy the deficiencies of Stewart, as Bowe also fails to teach or suggest a generally straight distal region extending beyond the generally circular curve and substantially tangentially to the generally circular curve, as recited in independent claims 1, 13, 22 and 25. Accordingly, independent claims 1, 13, 22 and 25, and all claims dependent therefrom, including claims 2-12, 17-20, 26 and 27, are allowable over Stewart and Bowe.

Appln No. 10/750,501
Amdt date June 11, 2007
Reply to Office action of January 9, 2007

Finally, the Examiner rejected claims 28 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly obvious over Stewart in view of Bowe and further in view of Webster, Jr. (U.S. Patent No. 5,836, the ablation assembly also having a generally straight distal region extending beyond the generally circular curve of the main region and substantially tangentially to the generally circular curve, as recited in independent claim 28. Accordingly, claim 28, and claim 29 which depends therefrom, are allowable over Stewart, Bowe and Webster, Jr.

Claims 1-29 remain pending in this application. By this amendment, Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, 22, 25 and 28. The amendments find full support in the original specification, claims and drawings. No new matter is presented. In light of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that all of pending claims 1-29 are in condition for allowance. Applicant therefore respectfully requests a timely indication of allowance. However, if there are any remaining issues that can be addressed by telephone, Applicant invites the Examiner to contact Applicant's counsel at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
CHRISTIE, PARKER & HALE, LLP

By 
Anne Wang
Reg. No. 36,045
626/795-9900

LES/les

LDB PAS741234.1.-*-06/11/07 3:30 PM